



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,163	12/31/2003	Anjing Lou	58653/01080	1562

31013 7590 11/22/2006

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

SHOSHO, CALLIE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/751,163

Applicant(s)

LOU ET AL.

Examiner

Callie E. Shosho

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. All outstanding rejections are overcome by applicants' amendment filed 9/20/06.

The new grounds of rejection set forth below are necessitated by applicants' amendment and thus, the following action is final.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 20, which depends on claim 1, discloses that printing is carried out "at about 1200 fpm" while claim 1 discloses that printing is carried out at "at least 1200 rpm". Thus, claim 20 fails to further limit the scope of the claim on which it depends, namely, claim 1 given that claim 20 is broader than claim 1. That is, while claim 1 is limited to printing speed of 1200 fpm or higher, claim 20 discloses printing speed of "about 1200 fpm" which, in light of the use of the word "about", includes values slightly below 1200 fpm which is outside the scope of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that the printing of the ink is carried out at “at least 1200 fpm” while newly added claim 20 recites that printing is carried out “at about 1200 fpm”. It is the examiner’s position that these phrases fail to satisfy the written description requirement under the cited statute since there does not appear to be a written description requirement of the cited printing speed in the application as originally filed, *In re Wright*, 866 F.2d 422, 9 USPQ2d 1649 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and MPEP 2163.

As support for the above amendment, applicants point to page 5, lines 19-22 of the present specification. However, while this portion of the present specification provides support to recite that printing is carried out “at 1200 fpm”, there is no support in the specification as originally filed to recite that printing is carried out at “at least 1200 fpm” which includes not only printing at 1200 fpm but all speeds above 1200 fpm, i.e. 1250 fpm, 1500 fpm, 3000 fpm, etc., for which there is no support in the specification as originally filed and no support to recite that printing is carried out at “about 1200 fpm” which, from use of the word “about”, includes values slightly above and below 1200 fpm for which there is no support in the specification as originally filed. Thus, while there is support to recite that printing is carried out “at 1200 fpm”, there is no support to recite “at least 1200 fpm” or “at about 1200 fpm”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 11, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leenders et al. (U.S. 6,890,584) taken in view of the evidence given in Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Leenders et al. disclose aqueous flexographic ink comprising styrene-acrylic copolymer, pigment including phthalocyanine pigment, sorbitol, and plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of adding styrene-acrylic acid and plasticizer to the ink (col.1, line 35, col. 8, lines 19-24, col.9, lines 16-17, col.12, line 35, col.13, lines 3-5, and col.21, lines 27-31).

Although there is no explicit disclosure of the speed at which the ink is printed, it is well known, as evidenced by Schriber et al. (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44), that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm.

Given that Leenders et al. disclose method as presently claimed including adding plasticizer and the styrene-acrylic copolymer to the ink prior to printing at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would inherently result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed.

In light of the above, it is clear that Leenders et al. anticipate the present claims.

7. Claims 11, 16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sulzberg (U.S. 4,173,554) taken in view of the evidence given in Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Sulzberg disclose aqueous flexographic ink comprising pigment, styrene-acrylic copolymer, and up to 3% plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of improving gloss comprising adding to the ink the styrene-acrylic acid and plasticizer wherein improvement is achieved in gloss including when printing on rough surface (col.1, lines 5-7 and col.2, lines 29-33, 39-47, 49-50, 54-56, and 54-57).

Although there is no explicit disclosure of the speed at which the ink is printed, it is well known, as evidenced by Schriber et al. (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44), that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm.

In light of the above, it is clear that Sulzberg anticipate the present claims.

8. Claims 11 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nigam et al. (U.S. 6,596,805) taken in view of the evidence given in Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Nigam et al. disclose aqueous composition including aqueous flexographic ink comprising pigment, styrene-acrylic copolymer, and plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of adding the plasticizer and styrene-acrylic acid to the ink (col.1, lines 9-12, col.2, lines 47-48, col.7, lines 16-35, col.8, line 6, and col.9, lines 19 and 32-42).

Although there is no explicit disclosure of the speed at which the ink is printed, it is well known, as evidenced by Schriber et al. (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44), that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm.

Given that Nigam et al. disclose method as presently claimed including adding plasticizer and the styrene-acrylic copolymer to the ink prior to printing at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would inherently result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed.

In light of the above, it is clear that Nigam et al. anticipate the present claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leenders et al. (U.S. 6,890,584), Sulzberg (U.S. 4,173,554), or Nigam et al. (U.S. 6,596,805) any of which in view of Sobieski (U.S. 2004/0071953).

The disclosures with respect to Leenders et al., Sulzberg, and Nigam et al. in paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 above are incorporated here by reference.

The difference between Leenders et al., Sulzberg, or Nigam et al. and the present claimed invention is the requirement in the claims of propyl lactate.

Sobieski et al., which is drawn to ink composition, disclose the use of alkyl lactate as adhesion promoter (paragraph 51). Although there is no disclosure that the lactate is a plasticizer, given that Sobieski et al. disclose alkyl lactate which clearly includes propyl lactate as presently claimed, it is clear that such lactate would intrinsically function as a plasticizer.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl lactate, including propyl lactate, in the ink of Leenders et al., Sulzberg, or Nigam et al. in order to effectively adhere ink to substrate, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

11. Claims 11, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al. '601 (U.S. 2004/0127601).

Sano et al. '601 disclose aqueous flexographic ink comprising carbon black, styrene-acrylic emulsion, and 1-40% sorbitol. There is also disclosed method comprising adding the plasticizer, i.e. sorbitol, and the styrene-acrylic emulsion to the ink (paragraphs 107, 119, 123 (lines 7-8), 165, and 151 (lines 6 and 20-22)). Given that Sano et al. disclose ink comprising styrene-acrylic and plasticizer as presently claimed, it is clear that adding the plasticizer and the styrene-acrylic copolymer to the ink would intrinsically result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed. Although there is no explicit disclosure of the speed at which the ink is printed, it is well known, as disclosed by Schriber et al. (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44), that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm.

While Sano et al. '601 fails to exemplify the presently claimed ink nor can the claimed ink be "clearly envisaged" from Sano et al. as required to meet the standard of anticipation (cf. MPEP 2131.03), nevertheless, in light of the overlap between the claimed ink and the ink disclosed by Sano et al., absent a showing of criticality for the presently claimed ink, it is urged that it would have been within the bounds of routine experimentation, as well as the skill level of

Art Unit: 1714

one of ordinary skill in the art, to use ink which is both disclosed by Sano et al. '601 and encompassed within the scope of the present claims and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sano et al. '601 as applied to claims 11, 14, and 16-20 above, and further in view of Sobieski (U.S. 2004/0071953)

The difference between Sano et al. '601 and the present claimed invention is the requirement in the claims of propyl lactate.

Sobieski et al., which is drawn to ink composition, disclose the use of alkyl lactate as adhesion promoter (paragraph 51). Although there is no disclosure that the lactate is a plasticizer, given that Sobieski et al. disclose alkyl lactate which clearly includes propyl lactate as presently claimed, it is clear that such lactate would intrinsically function as a plasticizer.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl lactate, including propyl lactate, in the ink of Sano et al. '601 in order to adhere ink to substrate, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

13. Claims 11, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leenders et al. (U.S. 6,890,584) in view of Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Leenders et al. disclose aqueous flexographic ink comprising styrene-acrylic copolymer, pigment including phthalocyanine pigment, sorbitol, and plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of adding styrene-acrylic acid and plasticizer to the ink (col.1, line 35, col. 8, lines 19-24, col.9, lines 16-17, col.12, line 35, col.13, lines 3-5, and col.21, lines 27-31).

Art Unit: 1714

There is no explicit disclosure in Leenders et al. of the speed at which the ink is printed.

Schriber et al. disclose that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44).

Given that Leenders et al. in combination with Schriber et al. disclose method as presently claimed including adding plasticizer and the styrene-acrylic copolymer to the ink prior to printing at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would intrinsically result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose to carry out printing at speeds, including at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, in Leenders et al. in order to perform high speed printing of the ink and quickly produce desired product, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

14. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leenders et al. in view of Schriber et al. as applied to claims 11, 14, and 19-20 above, and further in view of Sobieski (U.S. 2004/0071953)

The difference between Leenders et al. in view of Schriber et al. and the present claimed invention is the requirement in the claims of propyl lactate.

Sobieski et al., which is drawn to ink composition, disclose the use of alkyl lactate as adhesion promoter (paragraph 51). Although there is no disclosure that the lactate is a plasticizer, given that Sobieski et al. disclose alkyl lactate which clearly includes propyl lactate as presently claimed, it is clear that such lactate would intrinsically function as a plasticizer.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl lactate, including propyl lactate, in the ink of Leenders et al., in order to effectively adhere ink to substrate, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

15. Claims 11, 16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sulzberg (U.S. 4,173,554) in view of Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Sulzberg disclose aqueous flexographic ink comprising pigment, styrene-acrylic copolymer, and up to 3% plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of improving gloss comprising adding to the ink the styrene-acrylic acid and plasticizer wherein improvement is achieved in gloss including when printing on rough surface (col.1, lines 5-7 and col.2, lines 29-33, 39-47, 49-50, 54-56, and 54-57).

There is no explicit disclosure in Sulzberg of the speed at which the ink is printed.

Schriber et al. disclose that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44).

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose to carry out printing at speeds, including at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, in Sulzberg in order to perform high speed printing of the ink and quickly produce desired product, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

16. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sulzberg in view of Schriber et al. as applied to claims 11, 16, and 19-20 above, and further in view of Sobieski (U.S. 2004/0071953)

The difference between Sulzberg in view of Schriber et al. and the present claimed invention is the requirement in the claims of propyl lactate.

Sobieski et al., which is drawn to ink composition, disclose the use of alkyl lactate as adhesion promoter (paragraph 51). Although there is no disclosure that the lactate is a plasticizer, given that Sobieski et al. disclose alkyl lactate which clearly includes propyl lactate as presently claimed, it is clear that such lactate would intrinsically function as a plasticizer.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl lactate, including propyl lactate, in the ink of Sulzberg in order to effectively adhere ink to substrate, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

17. Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nigam et al. (U.S. 6,596,805) in view of Schriber et al. (U.S. 4,177,730).

Nigam et al. disclose aqueous composition including aqueous flexographic ink comprising pigment, styrene-acrylic copolymer, and plasticizer. There is also disclosed method of adding the plasticizer and styrene-acrylic acid to the ink (col.1, lines 9-12, col.2, lines 47-48, col.7, lines 16-35, col.8, line 6, and col.9, lines 19 and 32-42).

There is no explicit disclosure in Nigam et al. of the speed at which the ink is printed.

Schriber et al. disclose that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm (col.5, lines 1-4 and col.6, lines 37-44).

Given that Nigam et al. in combination with Schriber et al. disclose method as presently claimed including adding plasticizer and the styrene-acrylic copolymer to the ink prior to

printing at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would intrinsically result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose to carry out printing at speeds, including at 1200 fpm as presently claimed, in Nigam et al. in order to perform high speed printing of the ink and quickly produce desired product, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

18. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nigam et al. in view of Schriber et al. as applied to claims 11 and 19 above, and further in view of Sobieski (U.S. 2004/0071953)

The difference between Nigam et al. in view of Schriber et al. and the present claimed invention is the requirement in the claims of propyl lactate.

Sobieski et al., which is drawn to ink composition, disclose the use of alkyl lactate as adhesion promoter (paragraph 51). Although there is no disclosure that the lactate is a plasticizer, given that Sobieski et al. disclose alkyl lactate which clearly includes propyl lactate as presently claimed, it is clear that such lactate would intrinsically function as a plasticizer.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use alkyl lactate, including propyl lactate, in the ink of Nigam et al., in order to effectively adhere ink to substrate, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicants' arguments regarding Sano et al. '298 (U.S. 6,043,298) and EP 874030 have been considered but they are moot in view of the discontinuation of the use of these references against the present claims.

20. Applicants' arguments filed 9/20/06 have been fully considered but, with the exception of arguments relating to Sano et al. '298 and EP 874030, they are not persuasive.

Specifically, applicants argue that none of the rejections of record meet all the limitations of amended claims 11-20, specifically, the limitation that printing of the flexographic ink is carried out at at least 1200 fpm or at about 1200 fpm.

It is agreed that there is no explicit disclosure in Leenders et al., Sulzberg, Nigam et al., or Sano et al. '601 that printing of the flexographic ink is carried out at "at least 1200 fpm" or "at about 1200 fpm" as presently claimed.

This is why, on the one hand, Leenders et al., Sulzberg, and Nigam et al. are each taken in view of the evidence given in Schriber et al. that discloses that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm. Thus, it is clear that printing at speeds of 1200 fpm is an inherent feature of flexographic printing as disclosed by each of Leenders et al., Sulzberg, or Nigam et al.

On the other hand, each of Leenders et al., Sulzberg, and Nigam et al., are now used in combination with Schriber et al. which teaches that typical machines utilized for flexographic printing operate at speeds up to the order of 1200 fpm. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose to carry out printing at 1200 fpm in Leenders et al.,

Sulzberg, and Nigam et al. in order to perform high speed printing of the ink and quickly produce desired product, and thereby arrive at the claimed invention.

Given that each of Leenders et al., Sulzberg, Nigam et al., and Sano et al. '601 disclose method wherein styrene acrylic copolymer and plasticizer are added to ink prior to printing and given that each reference, either in view of the evidence given in Schriber et al. or alternatively, in view of Schriber et al., disclose carrying out printing of the ink at speeds as presently claimed, it is the examiner's position that Leenders et al., Sulzberg, Nigam et al., and Sano et al. '601 each meet the requirements of the present claims. While Sulzberg explicitly discloses that such method results in improvement in gloss as presently claimed, given that each of Leenders et al., Nigam et al., and Sano et al. '601 disclose method as presently claimed, it is clear that such method would inherently or intrinsically result in improvement of print gloss including on rough surfaces as presently claimed.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

WO 2004/0007578 and EP 556439 each disclose composition comprising plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer, however, there is no disclosure of method of improving gloss of a print of an ink comprising adding the plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer to aqueous flexographic ink wherein printing is carried out at at least 1200 fpm as presently claimed.

Krishnan et al. (U.S. 2003/0130376) disclose gravure ink comprising plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer, however, there is no disclosure of method of improving gloss of a print of an ink comprising adding the plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer to aqueous flexographic ink wherein printing is carried out at at least 1200 fpm as presently claimed.


JP 56055446 and JP 04366152 each disclose colorant for polyvinyl chloride comprising plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer, however, there is no disclosure of method of improving gloss of a print of an ink comprising adding the plasticizer and styrene-acrylic copolymer to aqueous flexographic ink wherein printing is carried out at at least 1200 fpm as presently claimed.

Art Unit: 1714

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Callie E. Shosho whose telephone number is 571-272-1123. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (6:30-4:00) Alternate Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Callie E. Shosho
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

CS
11/18/06